REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimada et al. (US 5,801,673).

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dupont et al. (US 5,206,632).

Claims 4-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada et al. or Dupont et al.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claim 1 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-12 are pending for consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimada et al. (US 5,801,673), claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dupont et al. (US 5,206,632), and claims 4-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada et al. or Dupont et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections as being based upon references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claim 1 and independent claim 2, and hence dependent claims 3-11.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display panel driving circuit including a plurality of capacitors, "wherein each of the plurality of capacitors simultaneously transmit the voltage to the pixels." Similarly, independent claim 2 recites a method for driving a

liquid crystal display including a step of "simultaneously transmitting each voltage of each data line capacitor to a pixel through at least one of the data lines."

In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, Shimada et al. teaches (col. 12, lines 60-63) successively turning on analog switches S with a sampling signal, and a data signal is sequentially supplied to the source bus line 2 corresponding to each analog switch S. Similarly, Dupont et al. teaches (col. 4, lines 57-60) that by activation of a selection line of a respective row, the voltages stored in column capacitors 35, 36, and 37 are fed line by line to the pixel elements of the display. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that both Shimada et al. and Dupont et al. teach successively/sequentially supplying data signals to data lines. Thus, neither Shimada et al. nor Dupont et al. teach or suggest a driving method including a step of "simultaneously transmitting each voltage of each data line capacitor to a pixel through at least one of the data lines," as recited by independent claim 2, and hence dependent claims 3-12, or a liquid crystal display panel driving circuit including a plurality of capacitors, "wherein each of the plurality of capacitors simultaneously transmit the voltage to the pixels," as recited by amended independent claim 1.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Shimada et al. nor Dupont et al. teach or suggest the novel combination of features of independent claim 1, as amended, and independent claim 2, and hence dependent claims 3-12.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: August 25, 2004

Customer Number: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
(202)739-3000